arXiv:1603.00122v1 [math.DS] 1 Mar 2016

Transmission dynamics of an SIS model with age structure on heterogeneous networks

Shanshan Chen[1], Michael Small[2,3], Yizhou Tao[1], Xinchu Fu[1,*]

[1]*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, China*

[2]*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Western Australia, 6009, Australia*

[3]*Mineral Resources, CSIRO, Kensington, 6151, Australia*

Abstract

Age at infection is often an important factor in epidemic dynamics. In this paper a disease transmission model of SIS type with age dependent infection on a heterogeneous network is discussed. The model allows the infectious rate and the recovery rate to vary and depend on the age of the infected individual at the time of infection. We address the threshold property of the basic reproduction number and present the global dynamical properties of the disease-free and endemic equilibria in the model. Finally, some numerical simulations are carried out to illustrate the main results. The combined effects of the network structure and the age dependent factor on the disease dynamics are displayed.

Key words: Basic reproduction number, age-structure, scale-free network, global stability.

1 Introduction

Infectious diseases remain a major challenge for human society. Epidemic diseases (cholera, tuberculosis, SARS, influenza, Ebola virus, etc.) continue to have both a major impact on human beings and an economic cost to society. Any gain we make in understanding the dynamics and control of epidemic

*Corresponding author. Tel: +86-21-66132664; Fax: +86-21-66133292; Email addresses: xcfu@shu.edu.cn (Xinchu Fu), sschen1214@163.com (Shanshan Chen)

transmission therefore has potential for significant impact — and hence has been the focus of scientific research and attracted much attention [1, 2].

Epidemic dynamic models provide a theoretical method for quantitative studies of infectious diseases. Since Kermack and Mckendrick proposed two fundamental epidemic models, the SIS and SIR compartmental models, to study disease transmission [3, 4], epidemic models for the transmission of infectious diseases have been studied extensively. These classical compartmental models are important tools in analyzing the spread and control of infectious diseases, but usually neglect the population structure or assume that all the individuals have the same possibility to contact the others — they are most effective for well-mixed homogeneous populations with a substantial penetration of infection. However, the spreading of infectious diseases is primarily via specific contacts between individuals, emerging diseases start with a relative small number of infectives, and the possibility to contact others is heterogeneous. Therefore, depicting the spread of disease processes on a contact network can be more realistic [5–8]. Currently, the most popular transmission models on networks are based on mean-field approximations and follow the framework initially proposed by Pastor-Satorras and Vespignani [9–11]. They were the first to study SIS and SIR epidemic models on a scale-free network and showed that the epidemic threshold is infinitesimal in the limit of a large number of links and nodes. Since then, a great deal of epidemiological research work followed on scale-free (and other) networks [12–17].

For some epidemic diseases, such as scarlet fever, poliomyelitis and HFMD (hand-foot-and-mouth), the process of their transmission is related to age and some public health and preventative policies for those diseases depend on the age structure of host population. Hence, in order to reflect the effect of demographic behavior of individuals, researchers have begun to examine age-structured epidemic models. The pioneering work in age-structured epidemic models was that of Hoppensteadt [18, 19], since then, the importance of age structure in epidemic models has been recently stressed by many authors [20–23]. Although age-dependent epidemic models have been studied extensively, all these models were established on homogeneous networks — in essence a convenient approximation to the homogeneous well-mixed population. There are still few significant results concerning age-structured epidemic models on complex (in this case, scale-free) networks.

The main purpose of this paper is to obtain threshold results for an age-structured epidemic model on scale-free networks. A scale-free network is characterized by a power-law degree distribution $p(k) \sim$

k^{-r} [24], where $p(k)$ is the probability that a randomly chosen node has degree k, and r is a characteristic exponent whose value is usually in the range $2 < r \leq 3$. We know that for many infectious diseases, transmission can be studied by using the SIS model with S and I representing the susceptible and infected individuals, respectively. Based on the SIS model with age structure, our work provides new insight into epidemic spreading dynamics.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we present our age-of-infection model and give some description and assumptions. In Section 3, we analyze the existence of equilibria and obtain the basic reproduction number. We then present some preliminaries for the analysis of stability, which includes asymptotic smoothness of the semi-flow generated by the system and the uniform persistence of the system. The main results of this paper are given in Section 4, which include the local stability and global stability of the disease-free and endemic equilibria. Some numerical analysis are performed in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we give conclusions and discussions.

2 Formulation of the model

Consider a population with connectivity modelled as a complex network N, where each node of N is either vacant or occupied by one individual. In an epidemic spreading process, every node has three optional states: vacant state, susceptible state, and, infected state [25, 26]. In order to consider the heterogeneity of contacts, we divide the population into n groups. Let $S_k(t)$, $I_k(t)$, $(k = 1, 2, ...n)$ denote the densities of susceptible and infected nodes (individuals) with connectivity (degree) k at time t, respectively, and let $I_k(t, \tau)$ denote the density of infected individuals with respect to the age of infection τ at time t. It is obvious that

$$I_k(t) = \int_0^\infty I_k(t, \tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

Noting that $S_k(t) + \int_0^\infty I_k(t, \tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = N_k(t)$, which describes the total density of the individuals with degree k at time t, then, the density of the vacant nodes with degree k is $1 - S_k - I_k(t)$.

In addition, as a disease spreads, a birth event occurs at a vacant node next to a non-vacant node at rate b, that is to say, the empty nodes will give birth to new individuals once one of their neighbours is occupied. Thus, the birth process depends on the number of neighboring individuals. All individuals die at rate μ, causing the occupied node becomes vacant. Let $\beta(\tau)$, $\gamma(\tau)$ represent infectious function and

removal function with respect to age of infection τ respectively. Therefore, the SIS epidemic model with the age-of-infection structure on a heterogeneous network is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} = bk[1 - N_k(t)]\Psi_k - \mu S_k(t) - kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial \tau} = -(\mu + \gamma(\tau))I_k(t,\tau), & 0 < \tau < \infty \\ I_k(t,0) = kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau, & 0 \le t < \infty \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\Theta_k(t,\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(i|k)\frac{\varphi(i)}{i}I_i(t,\tau), \quad \Psi_k(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(i|k)\frac{A}{i}N_i(t)$$

under the following initial conditions:

$$\begin{cases} S_k(0) = S_{k0} \ge 0\ , I_k(0,\tau) = I_{k0}(\tau) \in L^1_+(0,\infty), (k = 1, 2, ...n); \\ S_{k0} + \int_0^\infty I_{k0}(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = N_{k0}(k = 1, 2, ...n) \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where $L^1_+(0,\infty)$ is the space of functions on $[0,\infty)$ that are nonnegative and Lebesgue integrable.

The meaning of the parameters and variables of the above model are as follows:

- Let b and μ be positive constants denoting the birth and natural death rates of all individuals. The additional death rate induced by the infectious disease is not considered.

- $\langle k\rangle$ is the average degree of the network, i.e., $\langle k\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} ip(i)$. For a general function $\delta(k)$, this is defined as $\langle\delta(k)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta(i)p(i)$. Let $p(i|k)$ be the probability that a node of degree k is connected to a node of degree i. In present paper, we primarily study epidemic transmissions on uncorrelated networks, the probability is considered independent of the connectivity of the node from which the link is emanating. Therefore, $P(i|k) = \frac{iP(i)}{\langle k\rangle}$.

- $\Theta_k(t,\tau)$ describes the probability of a link pointing to an infected individual of age τ. We note that $\varphi(k)$ is the infectivity of nodes with degree k, i.e., it denotes the average number of edges from which a node with degree k can transmit the disease. Thus, $kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$ represents newly infected individuals per unit time.

- $\Psi_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(i|k)\frac{A}{i}N_i(t)$ is the probability of fertility contacts between nodes with degree k and its neighbours with degree i. The factor $\frac{1}{i}$ accounts for the probability that one of the neighboring individual of a vacant node with degree i, will activate this vacant node at the present time step.

It is assumed that, at each time step, every individual generates the same birth contacts A, here $A = 1$ [26]. Therefore, $bk[1 - N_k(t)]\Psi_k$ represents density of new born individuals per unit time.

Next we make the following assumptions on parameters, which are thought to be biologically relevant.

Assumption 2.1 *Consider the system* (2.1)*, we assume that,*

1. $b, \mu > 0$*;*
2. $\beta(\tau), \gamma(\tau) \epsilon L^1_+(0, +\infty)$*, with respective essential upper bounds* $\overline{\beta}$ *and* $\overline{\gamma}$*. Furthermore, there exists a constant* $\alpha > 0$ *such that* $\beta(\tau), \gamma(\tau) \geq \alpha$ *for all* $\tau \geq 0$*;*
3. $\beta(\tau), \gamma(\tau)$ *are Lipschitz continuous on* R_+ *with Lipschitz coefficients* M_β *and* M_γ*, respectively;*
4. *For all* $a \geq 0$ *and any k,* $I_{k0}(a) > 0$ *. Furthermore,* $\lim_{a\to\infty} I_{k0}(a) < +\infty$.

Let us define a functional space for system (2.1),

$$X = X_1 \times X_2 \times \ldots \times X_n, \;\; X_i = R^1_+ \times L^1_+, \; i = 1, 2, \cdots n.$$

Note that X is a closed subset of a Banach space, and hence is a complete metric space. The norm on X_k is taken to be

$$\|X_k\| = |S_k(t)| + \int_0^\infty |I_k(t, \tau)| \mathrm{d}\tau$$

By applying tools from [27, 28] and following from Assumption 2.1, it can be verified that the solution of system (2.1) exists and is nonnegative for any initial conditions. Thus, for $t \geq 0$ define a continuous flow $\Xi(t)$: $X \to X$ of system (2.1) such that

$$\Xi(t, X_0) = \varrho(t, X_0) = (S_1(t), I_1(t, \tau), S_2(t), I_2(t, \tau), \ldots, S_n(t), I_n(t, \tau))$$

where $\varrho(t, X_0)$ is the solution of the model (2.1) with initial condition $X_0 \in X$.

From the model (2.1), we get that N_k satisfies the following differential equation,

$$\frac{dN_k(t)}{dt} = bk[1 - N_k(t)]\Psi - \mu N_k(t) \tag{2.3}$$

Let $\frac{dN_k(t)}{dt} = 0$,we get $N_k = 0$, which corresponds to the equilibrium solution of extinction, and another solution satisfies

$$N_k = \frac{bk\Psi}{\mu + bk\Psi} \tag{2.4}$$

Putting the above equation (2.4) to Ψ, we obtain

$$\Psi = \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_i \frac{ip(i)b\Psi}{\mu + bi\Psi}$$

Noting that

$$f(\Psi) = 1 - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_i \frac{bip(i)}{\mu + bi\Psi}$$

it is clear that $f'(\Psi) > 0$, $f(1) = 1 - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_i \frac{bip(i)}{\mu + bi} > 1 - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_i \frac{bip(i)}{bi} > 0$. Thus, $f(\Psi) = 0$ has a unique positive solution if and only if $f(0) = 1 - \frac{b}{\mu} < 0$. That is ,when $b > \mu$, the equation (2.3) has a unique positive solution $N_k = N_k^*$, which satisfies

$$N_k^* = \frac{bk\Psi^*}{\mu + bk\Psi *} \ , \ \Psi^* = \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(i) N_i^*(t)$$

Therefore, from (2.3) and [38], when $b \leq \mu$, there is $\lim_{t \to \infty} N_k(t) = 0$, the population becomes extinct and there is no other dynamic behaviors any more. While, when $b > \mu$, $\lim_{t \to \infty} N_k(t) = N_k^*$. Therefore, we only consider the condition of $b > \mu$ in the following sections.

Since there are the same long-playing behaviors between the original system and the limiting system. To study the stability of system (2.1), we consider the limiting system under which $S_k(t) + \int_0^\infty I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = N_k^*$ as follows,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} = bk[1 - N_k^*]\Psi_k^* - \mu S_k(t) - kS_k(t) \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau) I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial \tau} = -(\mu + \gamma(\tau)) I_k(t,\tau) \\ I_k(t,0) = kS_k(t) \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

Finally, we define the state space for system (2.5) as

$$\Gamma = \{(S_1(t), I_1(t,\cdot), \cdots, S_n(t), I_n(t,\cdot)) \in X : 0 \leq S_k(t) + \int_0^\infty I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \leq 1, k = 1, \cdots, n\}$$

The following proposition shows that Γ is positively invariant with respect to system (2.5) for Ξ.

Proposition 2.1 *Γ is positively invariant of system* (2.5) *for Ξ . Moreover, Ξ is point dissipative (there exists a bounded set $\Gamma \subset X$ which attracts all points in X). That is , $\forall\ t \geq 0$, for any the solution of system* (2.5)*, noting as $\Phi(t, X_0)$,with the initial condition $X_0 \in \Gamma$. Then $\Phi(t, X_0) \in \Gamma$.*

Proof Define the arbitrary initial condition $X_0 \in \Gamma$, which satisfies (2.2). Thus, $\forall t > 0, N_{k0} \geq 0$, $\Psi(0) > 0$. From (2.3), we get

$$\frac{d\Psi(t)}{dt} = (b-\mu)\Psi(t) - \frac{b\Psi(t)}{\langle k\rangle}\Sigma_i ip(i)N_i(t)$$

It is obvious that $\Psi(t) = \Psi(0)e^{b-\mu-\frac{b}{\langle k\rangle}\Sigma_i ip(i)N_i(t)} > 0$. It follows from (2.4) that $N_k \geq 0$, and

$$0 \leq S_k(t) + \int_0^\infty I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = N_k = \frac{bk\Psi}{\mu + bk\Psi} \leq 1$$

Therefore, Ξ is point dissipative and Γ attracts all points in X . This completes the proof. ∎

According to Assumption 2.1 and the above results, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.2 *There exists a constant Λ satisfied $\Lambda > 1$, then the following statements hold true for $\forall t \geq 0$ and k(k=1,2,...n):*

(1) $0 < S_k(t), \int_0^{+\infty} I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau < \Lambda$*;*

(2) $\int_0^{+\infty} \beta(\tau)I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \leq \overline{\beta}\Lambda, \int_0^{+\infty} \gamma(\tau)I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \leq \overline{\gamma}\Lambda$*, and* $I_k(t,0) \leq \frac{\langle\varphi(k)\rangle}{\langle k\rangle}\overline{\beta}n\Lambda^2$.

(3) The function $\int_0^{\infty} \beta(\tau)I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$ *and* $\int_0^{\infty} \gamma(\tau)I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$ *are Lipschitz continuous with coefficient* M_β*,* M_γ *on* R_+.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Equilibria and the basic reproduction number

Firstly, with the above boundary conditions and initial conditions (2.2) , we obtain $I(t,\tau)$ by integrating the second differential equation in (2.5) along the characteristic line $t - \tau = constant$ [29],

$$I_k(t,\tau) = \begin{cases} I_k(t-\tau,0)H(\tau), & t \geq \tau; \\ I_k(0,\tau-t)\frac{H(\tau)}{H(\tau-t)} & 0 < t < \tau. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Where $H(\tau) = e^{-\mu\tau - \int_0^\tau \gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi}$.

Next, we consider the steady states of system (2.5). For simplicity, we note $Z_k(t) = I_k(t,0), (k = 1,2,...n)$. System (2.5) always has a disease-free equilibrium $E_0 : I_k^0 = 0, S_k^0 = \frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*}{\mu}$ $(k = 1,2...n)$.

Then, let us investigate the positive equilibrium of system (2.5). Any positive equilibrium E^* : $S_k^*, I_k^*(\tau)(k = 1, 2...n)$ should satisfy the following equations,

$$\begin{cases} bk[1 - N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k^* - kS_k^* \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta^*(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)I_k^*(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = 0 \\ \frac{dI_k^*(\tau)}{d\tau} = -(\mu + \gamma)I_k^*(\tau) \\ Z_k^* = kS_k^* \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta^*(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \Theta^*(\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i)p(i)I_i^*(\tau) \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

For ease of notation, let

$$K_1(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)e^{-\lambda\tau}H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau, \quad K_2(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)e^{-\lambda\tau}H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

We will get E^*, which satisfies

$$I_k^*(\tau) = I_k^*(0)H(\tau) = Z_k^*H(\tau)$$

$$S_k^* = \frac{\langle k\rangle Z_k^*}{kK_1(0)\sum \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i^*}, \ \ Z_k^* = \frac{bk[1 - N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k^*}{1 - K_2(0)}$$

To make sure that $S_k^* > 0$, and $I_k^*(\tau) > 0$ if and only if $Z_k^* > 0$. It is clear that

$$K_2(0) = \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)e^{-\mu\tau - \int_0^\tau \gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi}\mathrm{d}\tau \le \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)e^{-\int_0^\tau \gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi}\mathrm{d}\tau = 1 - e^{-\int_0^\infty \gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi} < 1$$

Hence, we obtain $Z_k^* > 0 \Longleftrightarrow \frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k^*}{1-K_2(0)} > 0 \Longleftrightarrow bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k^* > 0 \Longleftrightarrow \mu(S_k^0 - S_k^*) > 0 \Longleftrightarrow S_k^0 - S_k^* > 0 \Longleftrightarrow S_k^0 > \frac{\langle k\rangle Z_k^*}{kK_1(0)\sum \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i^*} \Longleftrightarrow \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum k\varphi(k)p(k)S_k^0K_1(0) > 1.$

From the above analysis, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *Define the basic reproduction number as follows,*

$$R_0 = \frac{K_1(0)}{< k >} \sum_{i=1}^n i\varphi(i)p(i)S_i^0$$

If $R_0 < 1$, the system (2.5) *has a unique disease-free equilibrium E^0; if $R_0 > 1$, there exist two equilibria E^0 and E^*, which satisfy $S_k^* = \frac{\langle k\rangle Z_k^*}{kK_1(0)\sum \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i^*}, I_k^*(\tau) = Z_k^*H(\tau), \ \ Z_k^* = \frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k^*}{1-K_2(0)}, k = 1, 2, \ldots n$.*

3.2 Asymptotic smoothness

In order to prove the global stability of model (2.5), we need to make the following preparations. First, we establish asymptotic smoothness of the semigroup $\Xi(t)$. The semigroup $\Xi(t)$ is asymptotically smooth,

if, for any nonempty, closed and bounded set $B \subset X$ for which Ξ(t,B)$\subset$ B, there is a compact set $J \subset B$ such that J attracts B. In order to obtain it, we will need the following lemmas and proposition.

Lemma 3.1 ([30]) *For each $t > 0$, suppose $\Xi(t) = \Psi(t) + \Upsilon(t) : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ has the property that $\Psi(t)$ is completely continuous and there is a continuous function k:$R^+ \times R^+ \to R^+$: such that $k(t, r) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ and $\|\Upsilon(t)X_0\| \leq k(t, r)$ if $\|X_0\| < r$. Then $\Xi(t), t \geq 0$, is asymptotically smooth.*

Lemma 3.2 ([31]) *Let $K \subset L^p_+(0, +\infty)$ be closed and bounded where $p \geq 1$. Then K is compact if and only if the following conditions hold:*
(i) $\lim_{h\to 0} \int_0^\infty |u(z + h) - u(z)|^p \mathrm{d}z = 0$ *uniformly for $u \in K$. ($u(z + h) = 0$ if $z + h < 0$).*
(ii) $\lim_{h\to\infty} \int_h^\infty |u(z)|^p \mathrm{d}z = 0$ *uniformly for $u \in K$.*

Proposition 3.1 *Let $J \subset R$. For $j = 1, 2$, suppose that $f_j : J \to R$ is a bounded Lipschitz continuous function with bound K_j and Lipschitz coefficient M_j. Then the product function $f_1 \cdot f_2$ is Lipschitz continuous with coefficient $K_1M_2 + K_2M_1$.*

From the above two lemmas, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2 *The semigroup Ξ is asymptotically smooth.*

Proof To apply Lemma 3.1, we define the projection of $\Xi(t)$ about any bounded set of X by decomposing $\Xi(t)$ into the following two operators,

$$\Xi(t) = U(t) + C(t)$$

where,

$$U(t) = (0, U_1(t), 0, U_2(t), \ldots, 0, U_n(t)), \;\; C(t) = (S_1(t), C_1(t), S_2(t), C_2(t), \ldots, S_n(t), C_n(t))$$

$$U_i(t) = \begin{cases} I_i(0, \tau - t)\frac{H(\tau)}{H(\tau - t)} & \tau \geq t \\ 0 & \tau < t \end{cases}, \;\; C_i(t) = \begin{cases} Z_i(t - \tau)H(\tau) & \tau < t \\ 0 & \tau \geq t \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

From equation (3.1), it is easy to get $\Xi(t) = U(t) + C(t)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|U_i(t)\| &= \int_0^\infty |U_i(t)|\mathrm{d}\tau = \int_t^\infty I_i(0,\tau-t)\frac{H(\tau)}{H(\tau-t)}\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= \int_t^\infty I_i(0,\tau-t)e^{-\mu t-\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}\gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\tau}\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\leq e^{-(\mu+\alpha)t}\int_t^\infty I_i(0,\tau-t)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\leq e^{-(\mu+\alpha)t}\|I_i(0,\tau)\|
\end{aligned}$$

If $\|X_0\| < r$, we note $k(t,r) = re^{-(\mu+\alpha)t}$, then, $k(t,r) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ and $\|U_i(t)\| \leq k(t,r)$ for any i.

Next, we verify that $C(t)$ is completely continuous. We need to pay more attention to the state space, since $L^1_+(0,+\infty)$ is a component of our state space X. Hence a notion of compactness in $L^1_+(0,+\infty)$ is necessary. In an infinite dimensional Banach space, boundedness does not necessarily imply precompactness. Hence, we need to prove it by applying Lemma3.2.

Suppose that $B \subset X$ is bounded for any initial condition $X_0 \subset B$. From Proposition 2.1, it is easy to see that $S_k(t), (k = 1, 2, ..n)$ remains in the compact set $[0, \Lambda]$. Thus, we only need to verify that the following conditions valid for $C_i(t)(i = 1, 2, ..n)$ remaining in a precompact subset of $L_+(0,+\infty)$.

To check condition (ii) , according to (3.3) ,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_i(t,\tau) &= iS_i(t-\tau)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\varphi(k)p(k)I_k(t-\tau,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau H(\tau) \\
&= iS_i(t-\tau)\frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(k)p(k)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)I_k(t-\tau,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau H(\tau) \\
&\leq i\frac{\langle\varphi(k)\rangle}{\langle k\rangle}\overline{\beta}\Lambda^2 e^{-(\mu+\alpha)\tau}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for all $X_0 \subset B$, $\lim_{h\to\infty}\int_h^\infty |C_i(t,\tau)|^p_{X_0}\mathrm{d}\tau = 0$. Therefore, (ii) is satisfied for the set $C_i(t,B) \subset L^1_+(0,+\infty)$.

To check condition (i), for sufficiently small $h \in (0,t)$, we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty |C_i(t,\tau) - C_i(t,\tau+h)|_{X_0}\mathrm{d}\tau \\
=\ &\int_0^{t-h} |Z_i(t-\tau-h)H(\tau+h) - Z_i(t-\tau)H(\tau)|\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_{t-h}^{t}|Z_i(t-\tau)H(\tau)|\mathrm{d}\tau \\
\leq\ &\int_0^{t-h} Z_i(t-\tau-h)|H(\tau+h) - H(\tau)|\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^{t-h}|Z_i(t-\tau-h) - Z_i(t-\tau)|H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
+\ &\int_{t-h}^{t} H(\tau)iS_i(t-\tau)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_k \varphi(k)p(k)I_k(t-\tau,\tau)|\mathrm{d}\tau
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $H(\tau) = e^{-\mu\tau - \int_0^\tau \gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi} \leq e^{-(\mu+\alpha)\tau} < 1$, and $H(\tau)$ is a decreasing function.

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{t-h} |H(\tau+h) - H(\tau)|\mathrm{d}\tau &= \int_0^{t-h} H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau - \int_0^{t-h} H(\tau+h)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= \int_0^{t-h} H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau - \int_h^{t} H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= \int_0^{h} H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau - \int_{t-h}^{t} H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \leq h\end{aligned}$$

Then, we note

$$\Delta = \int_0^{t-h} H(\tau)|Z_i(t-\tau-h) - Z_i(t-\tau)|\mathrm{d}\tau$$

From Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \int_0^{t-h} H(\tau)|Z_i(t-\tau-h) - Z_i(t-\tau)|\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= i\sum_k \frac{\varphi(k)p(k)}{\langle k\rangle} \int_0^{t-h} H(\tau)|S_i(t-\tau-h) \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) I_k(t-\tau-h,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &- S_i(t-\tau)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) I_k(t-\tau,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau|\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\leq i\frac{\langle\varphi(k)\rangle}{\langle k\rangle}\frac{[M_\beta\Lambda + \overline{\beta}\Lambda M_s]h}{\mu+\alpha}\end{aligned}$$

M_s is the coefficient of Lipschitz continuous function $S_k(t)(k = 1, 2, ...n)$. It is easy to see that $\frac{dS_k(t)}{dt}$ is bounded, and therefore, $S_k(t)$ is Lipschitz on $[0, \Lambda]$ with coefficient M_s.

$$\int_0^\infty |C_i(t,\tau) - C_i(t,\tau+h)|_{X_0}\mathrm{d}\tau \leq \Lambda h + i\frac{\langle\varphi(k)\rangle}{\langle k\rangle}\frac{[M_\beta\Lambda + \overline{\beta}\Lambda M_s]h}{\mu+\alpha} + i\frac{\langle\varphi(k)\rangle}{\langle k\rangle}\overline{\beta}\Lambda^2 h$$

This converges uniformly to 0 as $h \to 0$. Therefore, the condition (i) is verified for $C_i(t, X_0)$ $(i = 1, 2...n)$. From Lemma 3.2, we have that $C_i(t, X_0)$ is completely continuous. Finally, according to Lemma 3.1, we conclude that $\Xi(t, X_0)$ is asymptotically smooth. This completes the proof. ∎

Next, we show that the solution semigroup Ξ has a global compact attractor A in Γ.

We first give the following definition of global attractors.

Definition 1 ([30]) *A set A in Γ is defined to be an attractor if A is non-empty, compact and invariant, and there exists some open neighborhood W of A in Γ such that A attracts W. A global attractor is defined to be an attractor which attracts every point in Γ.*

From the results above, we can get the existence of a global attractor by applying the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.3 ([30]) *If Ξ is asymptotically smooth and point dissipative in Γ, and orbits of bounded sets are bounded in Γ, then there is a global attractor A in Γ.*

Propositions 2.1 and Theorem 3.2 show that the semigroup $\Xi(t)$ of system (2.5) is asymptotically smooth and point dissipative on the state space Γ. The proof of Proposition 2.1 can verify that every forward orbit of bounded sets is bounded in Γ. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3 *The semigroup Ξ generated by the system* (2.5) *on the state space Γ has a global attractor A in Γ.*

3.3 Uniform Persistence

In this section we study the uniform persistence of system (2.5). Let us define a function $\rho : X \to R$ that $\rho = (\rho_1, \rho_2, ..., \rho_n)$ as

$$\rho_k(X) = Z_k(t), \;\; k = 1, 2, \ldots n$$

Before introducing the result of persistence, we introduce the following important lemmas.

Lemma 3.4 (Fatou's Lemma) *Let f_n be a non-negative measurable function sequence, then it satisfies*

$$\int \lim_{t\to+\infty} \inf f_n \leq \lim_{t\to+\infty} \inf \int f_n \leq \lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup \int f_n \leq \int \lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup f_n \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.5 (Fluctuation Lemma) *Let*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup \Phi(t) = \Phi^{\infty}, \;\; \lim_{t\to+\infty} \inf \Phi(t) = \Phi_{\infty}$$

and $\Phi(t)$ be a bounded and continuously differentiable function. Then there exist sequences f_n and g_n such that $f_n \to \infty$, $g_n \to \infty$, $\Phi(f_n) \to \Phi^{\infty}$, $\Phi(g_n) \to \Phi_{\infty}$. $\Phi'(f_n) \to 0, \Phi'(g_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$.

Lemma 3.6 *If $R_0 > 1$, then there exists a positive constant $\varepsilon > 0$, such that for any k,*

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} Z_k(t) > \varepsilon \tag{3.5}$$

Proof If $R_0 > 1$, there exists a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{< k >} \sum_{i=1}^{n} i\varphi(i)p(i) \frac{bi[1 - N_i^*]\Psi^* - \varepsilon}{\mu} \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau > 1 \tag{3.6}$$

We now show that this small ε is the ε in (3.5). We will do this by contradiction. Assume that there exists a constant $T > 0$ which is sufficiently large such that

$$Z_k(t) \leq \varepsilon \qquad for\ t \geq\ T$$

Together with (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} &= bk[1 - N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k(t) - Z_k(t) + \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\geq bk[1 - N_k^*(t)]\Psi^* - \mu S_k - \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Then , according to the comparison principle,

$$S_k(t) \geq \frac{bk[1 - N_k^*(t)]\Psi^* - \varepsilon}{\mu} \qquad for\ t \geq\ T \tag{3.7}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.1) together with (3.7) and the Fluctuation Lemma, if g_n is a sequence such that $Z_k(g_n) \to Z_{k\infty}$, we have

$$Z_k(g_n) \geq k \frac{bk[1 - N_k^*]\Psi^* - \varepsilon}{\mu} \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i(g_n - \tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \tag{3.8}$$

Then, (3.8) becomes

$$1 \geq \frac{1}{< k >} \sum_{i=1}^{n} i\varphi(i)p(i) \frac{bi[1 - N_i^*]\Psi^* - \varepsilon}{\mu} \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

which contradicts to (3.6). That is to say, the system (2.5) is uniformly weakly ρ- persistent. The proof is therefore complete. ∎

Suppose a total trajectory of Ξ in space X is a function η: $R \to X$, such that $f(s + t) = \Xi(t, f(s))$, for $t \geq 0, s \in R$. Then, by applying Theorem 3.3, Lemma 3.5 and [32], we have the following result.

Theorem 3.4 *If $R_0 > 1$, $\Xi(t)$ is uniformly strongly ρ-persistent, that is, there exists a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that* $\liminf_{t\to\infty} Z_k(t) > \varepsilon$.

Finally, we introduce the result for uniform persistence of system (2.5).

Theorem 3.5 *If $R_0 > 1$, $\Xi(t)$ is uniform persistence, then, there exists a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any initial condition $X_0 \in X$ and any k,*

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} \|I_k(t,\tau)\| \geq \varepsilon, \quad \liminf_{t\to\infty} S_k(t) \geq \varepsilon$$

Proof In fact, for any k, ($k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$), following from (2.2) and (3.1), $I_k(0) \in L^1_+(0,\infty)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_k(t,\tau)\|_{L^1} &= \int_0^t I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_t^\infty I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\geq \int_0^t Z_k(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.4, we obtain that there exists a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfying the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{t\to\infty} \|I_k(t,\tau)\|_{L^1} &\geq \int_0^\infty \liminf_{t\to\infty} Z_k(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &> \varepsilon\int_0^\infty H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = \frac{\varepsilon}{\mu+\overline{\gamma}} \triangleq \varepsilon_1 \end{aligned}$$

Then, by a similar argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} &= bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi_k^* - \mu S_k(t) - kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\geq bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi_k^* - (\mu + k\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau)S_k(t) + \alpha(N_k^* - S_k(t)) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the comparison principle, we obtain $\liminf_{t\to\infty} S_k(t) \geq \frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi_k^* + \alpha N_k^*}{(\mu+\alpha)+k\frac{\langle\varphi(k)\rangle}{\langle k\rangle}\overline{\beta}\Lambda} \triangleq \varepsilon_2$. Therefore, we take $\varepsilon = \max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$, the proof is completed. ∎

4 The epidemic threshold

4.1 Local stability

In this section, we first evaluate the local stability of equilibria of system (2.5). For convenience, we apply (3.1) to get the following system of equations for model (2.5):

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} = bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k(t) - kS_k(t)\int_0^t \beta(\tau)\Theta_1(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau - B_k^1(t) + \int_0^t \gamma(\tau)Z_k(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + B_k^2(t) \\ Z_k(t) = kS_k(t)\int_0^t \beta(\tau)\Theta_1(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + B_k^1(t) \\ \Theta_1(t,\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i(t-\tau)H(\tau), \ \ t \geq \tau \\ \Theta_2(t,\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i)p(i)I_i(0,\tau-t)\frac{H(\tau)}{H(\tau-t)}, \ \ t < \tau \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

with equation (3.1), where,

$$B_k^1(t) = kS_k(t)\int_t^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta_2(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau, \ \ B_k^2(t) = \int_t^\infty \gamma(\tau)I_k(0,\tau-t)\frac{H(\tau)}{H(\tau-t)}\mathrm{d}\tau$$

It is obvious that $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} B_k^2(t) = 0, \ \lim\limits_{t\to\infty} B_k^1(t) = 0.$

Then considering the limiting system associated with (3.1):

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} = bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k(t) - kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta_1(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)Z_k(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ Z_k(t) = kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta_1(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

with the same initial conditions with (2.1) and $I_k(t,\tau)$ can get from (3.1), where

$$\Theta_1(t,\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i(t-\tau)H(\tau)$$

By using the Jacobian matrix and its characteristic equation, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.6 *If $R_0 < 1$, the disease-free equilibrium E_0 is locally asymptotically stable; and it is unstable while $R_0 > 1$.*

Proof First, linearizing (4.2) near E_0 by denoting the perturbation variables $S_k(t) = \tilde{S}_k(t) + S_k^0, Z_k(t) = \tilde{Z}_k(t), \Theta_1(t) = \theta(t)$, we obtain the following system

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\tilde{S}_k(t)}{dt} = -\mu\tilde{S}_k(t) - kS_k^0\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)\tilde{Z}_k(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \tilde{Z}_k(t) = k\tilde{S}_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \theta(t,\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i)p(i)\tilde{Z}_i(t-\tau)H(\tau) \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Analyzing the local asymptotic stability near E_0, let $\tilde{S}_k(t) = s_{k0}e^{\lambda t}, \tilde{Z}_k(t) = z_{k0}e^{\lambda t}$ and substitute them into (4.3), we get

$$\begin{cases} (\lambda+\mu)s_{k0} + \frac{kS_k^0}{<k>}K_1(\lambda)\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(i)p(i)z_{i0} - K_2(\lambda)z_{k0} = 0 \\ z_{k0} - \frac{kS_k^0}{<k>}K_1(\lambda)\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M}\varphi(i)p(i)z_{i0} = 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

Then, we can get the characteristic equation of (4.2),

$$\begin{vmatrix} \lambda+\mu & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1)-K_2(\lambda) & \frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & \frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \\ 0 & \lambda+\mu & \cdots & 0 & \frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & \frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2)-K_2(\lambda) & \cdots & \frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda+\mu & \frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & \frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & \frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n)-K_2(\lambda) \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1-\frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & -\frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & -\frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & 1-\frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & -\frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & -\frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & 1-\frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

which is equivalent to the following form,

$$\begin{vmatrix} (\lambda+\mu)E_n & A \\ 0 & B \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

That is to say, $(\lambda+\mu)E_nB = 0$, therefore, the eigenvalues are $\lambda_k = -\mu(k = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$, and satisfy $B = 0$, where,

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1-\frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & -\frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & -\frac{S_1^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \\ -\frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & 1-\frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & -\frac{2S_2^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ -\frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(1)p(1) & -\frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(2)p(2) & \cdots & 1-\frac{nS_n^0K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\varphi(n)p(n) \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

That is,

$$\frac{K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\sum_{i=1}^{n} i\varphi(i)p(i)S_i^0 = 1 \tag{4.5}$$

We denote $G(\lambda) = \frac{K_1(\lambda)}{<k>}\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} i\varphi(i)p(i)S_i^0$, which satisfies $G(\lambda)$=1.

Suppose that $\lambda = a + bi$ is the solution of $G(\lambda) = 1$ and $a \geq 0$. When $R_0 < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|G(\lambda)| &= |\frac{1}{< k >}\sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i^0 i\varphi(i)p(i)\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)H(\tau)e^{-(a+bi)\tau}\mathrm{d}\tau| \\
&= |\frac{1}{< k >}\sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i^0 i\varphi(i)p(i)\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)H(\tau)e^{-a\tau}(\cos(b\tau) - i\sin(b\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{< k >}\sum_{i=1}^{M} S_i^0 i\varphi(i)p(i)\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)H(\tau)e^{-a\tau}\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\leq \frac{1}{< k >}\sum_{i=1}^{M} S_i^0 i\varphi(i)p(i)\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = R_0 < 1.
\end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that $|G(\lambda)| < 1$ is contradictory to $G(\lambda) = 1$. Thus, $G(\lambda) = 1$ doesn't have positive solutions. So all roots of the characteristic equation are negative. Therefore, this means that if $R_0 < 1$, the disease-free equilibrium E_0 is locally asymptotically stable.

On the other hand, $K_1(\lambda) = \int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)H(\tau)e^{-\lambda\tau}\mathrm{d}\tau$, $\lim\limits_{\lambda\to-\infty} K_1(\lambda) = \infty$, $\lim\limits_{\lambda\to+\infty} K_1(\lambda) = 0$. Therefore, when $R_0 > 1$, $G(\lambda) = 1$ has positive real part, that is to say, E_0 is unstable. This completes the proof. ∎

Next, we discuss the local stability of the positive equilibrium. We have the following Theorem.

Theorem 4.7 *If $R_0 > 1$, system* (4.2) *has a unique positive equilibrium point $E^* = (S_k^*, Z_k^*)$, $k = 1, 2, ..., n$, and it is locally stable.*

Proof The existence of the positive equilibrium has been obtained in Section 3. As the same method applied in the discussion of the stability of disease-free equilibrium. First, linearizing the system (4.2) near E^*, that is, $S_k(t) = S_k^* + \tilde{S}_k(t)$, $Z_k(t) = Z_k^* + \tilde{Z}_k(t)$, we get the following linear system

$$\begin{cases}
\frac{d\tilde{S}_k(t)}{dt} = -\mu\tilde{S}_k(t) - kS_k^*\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)\theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau - k\tilde{S}_k(t)\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)\theta^*(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^{\infty}\gamma(\tau)\tilde{Z}_k(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
\tilde{Z}_k(t) = kS_k^*\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)\theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d} + k\tilde{S}_k(t)\int_0^{\infty}\beta(\tau)\theta^*(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
\theta^*(t,\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(i)p(i)Z_i^*(t-\tau)H(\tau)
\end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

Let $\tilde{S}_k(t) = s_{0k}e^{\lambda t}$, $\tilde{Z}_k(t) = z_{0k}e^{\lambda t}$, where s_{0k}, z_{0k} can be determined later, and substitute them into the

system (4.6), we obtain the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} (\lambda+\mu+kbc)s_{0k} + kS_k^*C(\lambda)\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(i)p(i)z_{0i} - K_2(\lambda)z_{0k} = 0 \\ kbcs_{0k} + kS_k^*C(\lambda)\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(i)p(i)z_{0i} - z_{0k} = 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

where $b = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(i)p(i)Z_i^*,\ c = \frac{K_1(0)}{\langle k\rangle},\ C(\lambda) = \frac{K_1(\lambda)}{\langle k\rangle},\ \varphi(i)p(i) = \varphi_i P_i$. Then, we analyze the local stability of the positive equilibrium E^*. From (4.7), we can get the characteristic equation as follows:

$$\begin{vmatrix} \lambda+\mu+bc & 0 & \dots & 0 & S_1^*C(\lambda)\varphi_1P_1-K_2(\lambda) & S_1^*C(\lambda)\varphi_2P_2 & \dots & S_1^*C(\lambda)\varphi_nP_n \\ 0 & \lambda+\mu+2bc & \dots & 0 & 2S_2^*C(\lambda)\varphi_1P_1 & 2S_2^*C(\lambda)\varphi_2P_2-K_2(\lambda) & \dots & 2S_2^*C(\lambda)\varphi_nP_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \lambda+\mu+nbc & nS_n^*C(\lambda)\varphi_1P_1 & nS_n^*C(\lambda)\varphi_2P_2 & \dots & nS_n^*C(\lambda)\varphi_nP_n-K_2(\lambda) \\ bc & 0 & \dots & 0 & S_1^*C(\lambda)\varphi_1P_1-1 & S_1^*C(\lambda)\varphi_2P_2 & \dots & S_1^*C(\lambda)\varphi_nP_n \\ 0 & 2bc & \dots & 0 & 2S_2^*C(\lambda)\varphi_1P_1 & 2S_2^*C(\lambda)\varphi_2P_2-1 & \dots & 2S_2^*C(\lambda)\varphi_nP_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & nbc & nS_n^*C(\lambda)\varphi_1P_1 & nS_n^*C(\lambda)\varphi_2P_2 & \dots & nS_n^*C(\lambda)\varphi_nP_n-1 \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

Note that $m_i = \frac{ibc}{\lambda+\mu+ibc},\ i = 1, 2...n$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}[\frac{(1-m_i)S_i^*i\varphi_iP_iC(\lambda)}{m_iK_2(\lambda)-1}+1]\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}(m_iK_2(\lambda)-1) = 0 \tag{4.8}$$

Case 1. If $\prod\limits_{i=1}^{n}(m_iK_2(\lambda)-1) = 0$, that is to say, $K_2(\lambda) = 1+\frac{\lambda+\mu}{ibc}, i = 1, 2, ...n$. We assume that $\lambda \geq 0$, then it is obvious that

$$K_2(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)e^{-\lambda\tau}H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)e^{-(\lambda+\mu)\tau-\int_0^\tau\gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\tau}\mathrm{d}\tau \ \leq\ \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)e^{-\int_0^\infty\gamma(\xi)\mathrm{d}\tau}\mathrm{d}\tau \ <\ 1$$

However, $1+\frac{\lambda+\mu}{ibc} \geq 1$, thus, the assumption is contradictory. Therefore, if $\prod\limits_{i=1}^{n}(m_iK_2(\lambda)-1) = 0$, the eigenvalue is negative.

Case 2. If $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}[\frac{(1-m_i)S_i^*i\varphi_iP_iC(\lambda)}{m_iK_2(\lambda)-1}+1] = 0$, substituting m_n,b, c and $C(\lambda)$ into the above equation, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{(\lambda+\mu)i\varphi(i)P(i)S_i^*}{i\sum\varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*[1-K_2(\lambda)]+(\lambda+\mu)\frac{\langle K\rangle}{K_1(0)}} = \frac{K_1(0)}{K_1(\lambda)}$$

Due to $S_k^* = \frac{\langle k\rangle Z_k^*}{kK_1(0)\sum\varphi(i)p(i)Z_i^*}$, then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{(\lambda+\mu)\langle k\rangle\varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*}{i[\sum\varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*]^2K_1(0)[1-K_2(\lambda)]+(\lambda+\mu)\langle k\rangle\sum_i\varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*} = \frac{K_1(0)}{K_1(\lambda)}$$

It is obvious that

$$\frac{K_1(0)}{K_1(\lambda)} \ <\ \frac{(\lambda+\mu)\langle k\rangle\sum_i\varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*}{[\sum_i\varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*]^2K_1(0)[1-K_2(\lambda)]+(\lambda+\mu)\langle k\rangle\sum_i\varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*}$$

Supposing $Re\lambda \geq 0$, then we have $|\frac{K_1(0)}{K_1(\lambda)}| \geq 1$, whereas,

$$\frac{(\lambda+\mu)\langle k\rangle \sum_i \varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*}{[\sum_i \varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*]^2 K_1(0)[1-K_2(\lambda)] + (\lambda+\mu)\langle k\rangle \sum_i \varphi(i)P(i)Z_i^*} < 1$$

Therefore, the assumption is also contradictory. So all the eigenvalues are negative.

To sum up, (4.8) do not have roots with positive real parts, therefore, all the roots of (4.8) have negative real parts. Therefore, the endemic equilibrium E^* is locally asymptotically stable if $R_0 > 1$. The proof is complete. ∎

4.2 Global stability of equilibria

In this section, we first study the global stability of the disease-free equilibrium E_0 by using the Fluctuation Lemma and Fatou's Lemma [33]. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.8 *If $R_0 < 1$, the disease-free equilibrium E_0 of the system* (2.5) *is globally asymptotically stable.*

Proof Because $Z_k(t) > 0$, let $V_k(t) = \int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)Z_k(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$, which is nonnegative.

$$\frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} = bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^* - \mu S_k(t) - Z_k(t) + V_k(t) \ \leq \ bk[1-N_k^*(t)]\Psi^* - \mu S_k + V_k(t)$$

According to the comparison principle and Proposition 2.2, it is easy to get the following equation:

$$S_k(t) \leq S_{k0}e^{-\mu t} + \frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*}{\mu}(1-e^{-\mu t}) + \int_0^t V_k(\xi)e^{-\mu(t-\xi)}\mathrm{d}\xi$$

That is to say, $\lim\limits_{t\to+\infty} \sup S_k(t) \ = S_k^\infty \ \leq \ \frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*}{\mu} = S_k^0$.

Then, we verify $\lim\limits_{t\to+\infty} Z_k(t) = 0 \ (k = 1,2,...,n)$. From the system (4.2), we know $\{Z_k(t)\}$ $(k = 1,2,\cdots,n)$ is a measurable sequence of non-negative uniformly bounded functions. Based on Fatou's Lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup Z_k(t) &= \lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup \frac{kS_k(t)}{\langle k\rangle} \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
\lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup Z_k(t) &\leq \frac{kS_k^\infty}{\langle k\rangle} \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) \lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i)p(i)Z_i(t-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we let the inequality be multiplied by $\varphi(k)p(k)$ and sum over k, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(k)p(k)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_k(t) &\leq \frac{k\varphi(k)S_k^0p(k)}{\langle k\rangle}\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_i(t)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
\sum_k \varphi(k)p(k)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_k(t) &\leq \frac{\sum_k k\varphi(k)S_k^0p(k)}{\langle k\rangle}\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_i(t)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
\sum_k \varphi(k)p(k)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_k(t) &\leq \frac{K_1(0)}{<k>}\sum_{k=1}^n S_k^0k\varphi(k)p(k)\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_i(t) \\
\sum_k \varphi(k)p(k)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_k(t) &\leq R_0\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_i(t)
\end{aligned}$$

Because $R_0<1$, so if this inequality holds only when $\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_i(t)=0$, that is,

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\sup Z_k(t)=0$$

On the other hand, $Z_k(t)_\infty \geq 0$ because the positive definiteness. Then, we get $\lim_{t\to+\infty} Z_k(t)=0$. Moreover, Lemma 3.5 implies that there exists a sequence g_n, such that $g_n\to\infty$, then $\Phi(g_n)\to\Phi_\infty$ and $\Phi'(g_n)\to 0$, as $n\to\infty$. Thus,

$$\frac{dS_k(g_n)}{dt}=bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*-\mu S_k(g_n)-Z_k(g_n)+\int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)Z_k(g_n-\tau)H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

Let $n\to\infty$, then,

$$bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*-\mu S_{k\infty}-Z_k^\infty+\int_0^\infty \gamma(\tau)Z_{k\infty}H(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \leq 0$$

Because of $Z_{k\infty}$, $Z_k^\infty\to 0$, then, $\frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*}{\mu}\leq S_{k\infty}$. Thus $\frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*}{\mu}\leq S_{k\infty}\leq S_k^\infty\leq\frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*}{\mu}$. That is, $\lim_{t\to+\infty}S_k(t)=\frac{bk[1-N_k^*]\Psi^*}{\mu}=S_k^0$ $(k=1,2,...n)$.

To sum up, $(S_k(t),Z_k(t))\to E_0$ in Γ for any $k=1,2,\ldots,n$, as $t\to\infty$. The proof is therefore completed. ∎

In the following, we verify the global stability of E^* of the system (4.2) by Lyapunov-LaSalle asymptotic stability theorem for the semiflow $\Xi(t)$. Now, to simplify the model (2.5), we let $\gamma(\tau)=\gamma$ be a constant. Since $S_k(t)+\int_0^\infty I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau=N_k^*$, hence we have $\int_0^\infty I_k(t,\tau)d\tau=N_k^*-S_k(t)$. For

convenience, we denote $bk[1-N_k^*(t)]\Psi^* + \gamma N_k^* = \Lambda_k$. Then model (2.5) can be represented as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} = \Lambda_k - (\mu+\gamma)S_k(t) - kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial \tau} = -(\mu+\gamma(\tau))I_k(t,\tau) \\ I_k(t,0) = kS_k(t)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \Theta(t,\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{n=1}^{M}\varphi(n)p(n)I_n(t,\tau) \end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

Theorem 4.9 *If $R_0 > 1$, the endemic equilibrium E^* of the system* (4.9) *is globally asymptotically stable.*

Proof Firstly, we introduce the following important function, which is obtained from the linear combination of Volterra-type functions of the form

$$g(x) = x - 1 - \ln x$$

Obviously, $g(x) \geq 0$ for $x > 0$ and $g'(x) = 1 - 1/x$. Then, $g(x)$ has a global minimum at $x = 1$ and $g(1) = 0$. That is to say, $g(x)$ is nonnegative.

Next, constructing the positively definite Lyapunov functional $V_k(t) = V_{S_k}(t) + V_{I_k}(t)$, where,

$$V_{S_k}(t) = S_k^*(\frac{S_k(t)}{S_k^*} - 1 - \ln\frac{S_k(t)}{S_k^*})$$

$$V_{I_k}(t) = \frac{kS_k^*}{\langle k\rangle}\frac{\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)}\int_0^\infty \pi(\tau)I_k^*(\tau)(\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} - 1 - ln\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)})\mathrm{d}\tau$$

We denote $\pi(\tau) = \int_\tau^\infty \beta(\xi)e^{-(\mu+\gamma)(\xi-\tau)}\mathrm{d}\xi$, which satisfies

$$\pi(0) = \int_0^\infty \beta(\xi)H(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi = K_1(0)$$

$$\frac{d\pi(\tau)}{d\tau} = (\mu+\gamma)\pi(\tau) - \beta(\tau)$$

Because the positive equilibrium E^* satisfies (3.2), we obtain

$$I_k^*(\tau) = I_k^*(0)H(\tau)$$

$$\Lambda_k = (\mu+\gamma)S_k^* - kS_k^*\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\Theta^*(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

$$I_k^*(0) = \frac{kS_k^*}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(i)p(i)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)I_i^*(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau = \frac{kS_k^*}{\langle k\rangle}K_1(0)\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(i)p(i)I_i^*(0)$$

To prove that the Lyapunov functional $V_k(t)$ is well-defined, it suffices to show that

$$\triangle_1 \triangleq \int_0^\infty I_k^*(\tau) ln \frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} \mathrm{d}\tau, \;\; \triangle_2 \triangleq S_k^* ln \frac{S_k(t)}{S_k^*}$$

are finite for all $t \geq 0$ and all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. It is clearly true from Theorem 3.5, $\triangle_2$ is finite for all $t \geq 0$ and all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Meanwhile, Assumption 2.1 and Theorem 3.5 ensure that $\triangle_1$ is finite for all $t \geq 0$ and all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Then, the derivative of V_k along the solutions of (4.9) is

$$\frac{dV_k(t)}{dt} = \frac{dV_{S_k}(t)}{dt} + \frac{dV_{I_k}(t)}{dt}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dV_{S_k}(t)}{dt} &= (1 - \frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)}) \frac{dS_k(t)}{dt} \\
&= -\frac{(\mu+\gamma)}{S_k(t)} (S_k - S_k^*)^2 + k S_k^* \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) \Theta^*(\tau) \mathrm{d}\tau - k S_k \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) \Theta(t,\tau) \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\quad - \frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} k S_k^* \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) \Theta^*(\tau) \mathrm{d}\tau + k S_k^* \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) \Theta(t,\tau) \mathrm{d}\tau
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dV_{I_k}(t)}{dt} &= \frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} \int_0^\infty \pi(\tau) I_k^*(\tau) (\frac{1}{I_k^*(\tau)} - \frac{1}{I_k(t,\tau)}) \frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial t} \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= -\frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} \int_0^\infty \pi(\tau) I_k^*(\tau) (\frac{1}{I_k^*(\tau)} - \frac{1}{I_k(t,\tau)}) [\frac{\partial I_k(t,\tau)}{\partial \tau} + (\mu+\gamma) I_k(t,\tau)] \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= -\frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} \int_0^\infty \pi(\tau) I_k^*(\tau) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} g[\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}] \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= -\pi(\infty) I_k^*(\infty) g[\frac{I_k(t,\infty)}{I_k^*(\infty)}] \frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} + \pi(0) \frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} I_k^*(0) g(\frac{I_k(t,0)}{I_k^*(0)}) \\
&\quad + \frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} \int_0^\infty [\frac{d\pi(\tau)}{d\tau} I_k^*(\tau) + \frac{dI_k^*(\tau)}{d\tau} \pi(\tau)] g(\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}) \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= -\pi(\infty) I_k^*(\infty) g[\frac{I_k(t,\infty)}{I_k^*(\infty)}] \frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} + \pi(0) \frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} I_k^*(0) g(\frac{I_k(t,0)}{I_k^*(0)}) \\
&\quad - \frac{k S_k^*}{\langle k \rangle} \frac{\sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)} \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) I_k^*(0) H(\tau) g(\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}) \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= -B + I_k(t,0) - I_k^*(0) + I_k^*(0) ln \frac{I_k(t,0)}{I_k^*(0)} - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_i \varphi(i) p(i) k S_k^* \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau) I_i^*(\tau) g(\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}) \mathrm{d}\tau
\end{aligned}$$

where $B = -\pi(\infty)I_k^*(\infty)g(\frac{I_k(t,\infty)}{I_k^*(\infty)})\frac{kS_k^*}{\langle k\rangle}\frac{\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)I_i^*(0)}{I_k^*(0)}$. Then, from the above two parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dV_k(t)}{dt} = & - \frac{(\mu+\gamma)}{S_k(t)}(S_k - S_k^*)^2 - B + \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)kS_k^*I_i^*(\tau)[1 - \frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} + \frac{I_i(t,\tau)}{I_i^*(\tau)} \\
& - \frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)} - ln\frac{I_k(t,0)}{I_k^*(0)} - \frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} + 1 + ln\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}]\mathrm{d}\tau \\
= & - \frac{(\mu+\gamma)}{S_k(t)}(S_k - S_k^*)^2 - B + \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)\frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)kS_k^*I_i^*(\tau)[1 - \frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} + ln\frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} \\
& + 1 - \frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)} + ln\frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)} \\
& + \frac{I_i(t,\tau)}{I_i^*(\tau)} - ln\frac{I_i(t,\tau)}{I_i^*(\tau)} - \frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} + ln\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}]\mathrm{d}\tau \\
= & - \frac{(\mu+\gamma)}{S_k(t)}(S_k - S_k^*)^2 - B + \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)kS_k^*I_i^*(0)\int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)H(\tau)[1 - \frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} + ln\frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} + 1 \\
& - \frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)} + ln\frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)} + \frac{I_i(t,\tau)}{I_i^*(\tau)} - ln\frac{I_i(t,\tau)}{I_i^*(\tau)} - \frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} + ln\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}]\mathrm{d}\tau
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$a_{ki}(\tau) = \frac{1}{\langle k\rangle}\sum_i \varphi(i)p(i)kS_k^*I_i^*(0)$$

$$f(x) = 1 - x + \ln x$$

$$G_k(I_k) = \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)H(\tau)[-\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} + ln\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)}]\mathrm{d}\tau$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Upsilon_{ki}(t, S_k, I_k(t,\cdot)) = & \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)H(\tau)[1 - \frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} + ln\frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)} + 1 - \frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)} + ln\frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)} \\
& - \frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} + ln\frac{I_k(t,\tau)}{I_k^*(\tau)} - (-\frac{I_i(t,\tau)}{I_i^*(\tau)} + ln\frac{I_i(t,\tau)}{I_i^*(\tau)})]\mathrm{d}\tau
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{dV_k}{dt} \le \sum_i a_{ki}\Upsilon_{ki}(t, S_k, I_k(t,\cdot))$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Upsilon_{ki}(t, S_k, I_k(t,\cdot)) = & \int_0^\infty \beta(\tau)H(\tau)[f(\frac{S_k^*}{S_k(t)}) + f(\frac{S_k(t)I_i(t,\tau)I_k^*(0)}{S_k^*I_i^*(\tau)I_k(t,0)})]\mathrm{d}\tau + G_k(I_k) - G_i(I_i) \\
\le & \; G_k(I_k) - G_i(I_i)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, according to Corollary 3.3 and Theorem 3.1 in [34], $V_k, \Upsilon_{ki}, G_{ki}, a_{ki}$ satisfy the assumptions. Therefore, the function $V = \sum_k c_k V_k$ which is defined in Corollary 3.3 is a Lyapunov function for system (4.9). It is obvious that $V'(t) \le 0$ for the model (4.9) and $(S_1, I_1(t,\tau), \cdots, S_n, I_n(t,\tau)) \in \Gamma$.

In addition, the largest invariant set for $V'(t) = 0$ is E^*. Then, the positive solution of system (4.9) is globally asymptotically stable according to Theorem 5.3.1 and Corollary 5.3.1 in [35]. The proof is therefore completed. ∎

5 Simulations

We know that the stability of the disease-free and endemic equilibria depends on the basic reproduction number. Here we present numerical simulations to explore the effects of various parameters on the basic reproduction number, and to support the analytic results obtained in the previous sections.

To simulate the process of system (2.1), we first adopt a first-order upwind scheme with forward Euler time step to process the second PDEs of (2.1); Consequently, we use a Runge-Kutta scheme to deal with the first ODEs of (2.1). The partition of mesh is $\Delta t = 0.1$ and $\Delta\tau = 0.2$, which satisfies the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy stability restriction condition for PDEs.

Our simulations are based on scale-free uncorrelated networks with the degree distribution $p(k) = ck^{-r}$, where $r = 2.4$, and the constant c satisfies $\Sigma_{k=1}^{n} k^{-r} = 1$. We set the maximum degree $n = 40$. The initial values $S_k(0) = 0.6$, $I_k(0,\tau) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{-(\tau+1.15)^2}{2}}$ for any degree k. The other parameters are chosen as $b = 0.07$ and $\mu = 0.06$.

First, Fig. 1 depicts the influence of $\varphi(k)$ on R_0 where $\varphi(k)$ is the infectivity of the disease. This function has many potential forms, such as $\varphi(k) = k$ [9, 11], which means that the number of the contacts per unit time is equal to the node's degree k; $\varphi(k) = h$ [36], which means that the number of the contacts per unit time is equal to the constant h and has no relation with the node's degree; or (for example), $\varphi(k) = \frac{\omega k^a}{1+\nu k^a}$ [37]. Here, we discuss out results assuming this general form. Fig. 1 shows that R_0 is monotonically increasing as α increases. The bigger a is and the smaller b is, the bigger R_0 is. This implies that the contact method can influence disease transition — as expected.

Next, we present the evolution of $I_k(t)$ over time under different parameters from Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 with the infectivity $\varphi(k) = k$, where $I_k(t) = \int_0^\infty I_k(t,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$. Fig. 2 shows that the evolutions of the density of infection with regard to time and degree under the parameters chosen as $\beta(\tau) = \frac{\tau(200-\tau)}{15000}, \gamma(\tau) = \frac{1}{1+\tau}$, which ensures that $R_0 < 1$. Fig. 2(a) shows that the time series of $I_{10},\ I_{20}$, I_{30} and I_{40}. Fig. 2(b)

depicts the overall trend of infection with all degrees. They clearly demonstrate that when $R_0 < 1$ the disease will gradually die out, and the disease-free equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable. That is, $\lim_{t\to+\infty} I_k(t) = 0$. In addition, we conclude that the larger the degree, the higher the peak of infection.

In Fig. 3, we show the evolution of $I_k(t)$ over time with infectivity $\varphi(k) = k$ under the parameters chosen as $\beta(\tau) = \frac{\tau(200-\tau)}{15000}, \gamma(\tau) = \frac{1}{1+10\tau}$, the basic reproduction number satisfies $R_0 > 1$. In this case, simulation indicates that the disease eventually become endemic, and tends to the endemic equilibrium which is globally asymptotically stable. Moreover, the larger the degree, the higher the endemic level. Therefore, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 can support the results obtained in previous sections, and ensure the global stability when $\gamma(\tau)$ is not an constant.



Figure 1: (Color online) The influence of $\varphi(k)$ on R_0, here $\varphi(k) = \frac{ak^\alpha}{1+bk^\alpha}$



(a) Dynamics of I_k(t) subject to time t



(b) Dynamics of I_k(t) subject to time t

Figure 2: (Color online) Here $\varphi(k) = k, \beta(\tau) = \frac{\tau(200-\tau)}{15000}, \gamma(\tau) = \frac{1}{1+\tau}, \mu = 0.06, b = 0.07, R_0 = 0.6066$



(a) Dynamics of I(t) subject to time t (b) Dynamics of I(t) subject to time t

Figure 3: (Color online) Here $\varphi(k) = k, \beta(\tau) = \frac{\tau(200-\tau)}{15000}, \gamma(\tau) = \frac{1}{1+10\tau}, \mu = 0.06, b = 0.07, R_0 = 3.4798$

6 Conclusions and discussions

In this paper, we propose and analyze an SIS epidemic model with age-structure on scale-free networks. By using various analytic methods, we demonstrate the asymptotic smoothness of solutions and uniform persistence of the system (2.1) via analyzing its limiting system (2.5) with Volterra integral equations. We found that the basic reproduction number is not only related to the network structure, but also depends on parameters which relate to each individual's age. In addition, we showed that the disease-free equilibrium in model (2.5) is globally asymptotically stable if $R_0 < 1$ by analyzing the corresponding characteristic equations and applying Fatou's Lemma. Meanwhile, if $R_0 > 1$, the system has a unique endemic equilibrium, which is globally asymptotically stable by constructing proper Volterra-type Lyapunov functionals. Finally, we performed some simulations under different parameters and $\varphi(k)$, which confirmed our theoretical results.

The factor of age-structure is necessary when study some particular diseases, therefore, in order to analyze the spreading mechanism and dynamical behavior of epidemic diseases more realistically, our findings in this paper are valuable for the further study of age-structured models on complex networks.

Acknowledgment

This work was jointly supported by the NSFC grants 11331009 and 11572181. And the paper was partly done while visiting the Center for Mathematical Sciences, at Huazhong University of Science and

Technology, Wuhan, China.

References

[1] Anderson, R. M., and May, R. M., Infectious Diseases of Humans, Oxford Univ. Press, 1991.

[2] Bailey, N.T.J., The Mathematical Theory of Infectious Disease, (2nd ed.), New York: Hafner, 1975.

[3] Kermack, W.O., Mckendrick, A.G., Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics. Proc. Roy. Soc. 1927, A 115: 700-721.

[4] Kermack, W.O., Mckendrick, A.G., Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics. Proc. Roy. Soc. 1932, A 138: 55-83.

[5] Levin, S.A., and Durrett, R., From individuals to epidemics. Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, 1996, B 351: 1615-1621.

[6] Read, J.M., and Keeling, M.J., Disease evolution on networks: the role of contact structure. Proc. Roy. Soc., 2003, B 270: 699-708.

[7] Keeling, M.J., and Eames, K.T.D., Networks and epidemic models. J. Roy. Soc. Interface, 2005, 2: 295-307.

[8] Durrett, R., and Jung, P., Two phase transitions for the contact process on small worlds. Stochastic Proc. & Their Appl., 2007, 117: 1910-1927.

[9] Pastor-Satorras, R. and Vespignani, A., Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2001, 86: 3200-3203.

[10] Pastor-Satorras, R., and Vespignani, A., Epidemic dynamics in finite size scale-free networks. Phys. Rev. E, 2002, 65: 035108.

[11] Pastor-Satorras, R., and Vespignani, A., Epidemic dynamics and endemic states in complex networks. Phys. Rev. E, 2001, 63: 066117.

[12] Bai, W.J., Zhou, T., et al., Immunization of susceptible-infected model on scale-free networks. Physica A 2007, 384: 656.

[13] Olinky R., Stone L., Unexpected epidemic threshold in heterogeneous networks: the role of disease transmission. Phys. Rev. E, 2004, 70: 030902.

[14] Zhu, G.H., Fu, X.C., Chen, G.R., Spreading dynamics and global stability of a generalized epidemic model on complex heterogeneous networks. Appl. Math. Model., 2012, 36: 5808-5817.

[15] Fu, X.C., Small, M., Walker, D.M., Zhang, H.F., Epidemic dynamics on scale-free networks with piecewise linear infectivity and immunization. Phys. Rev. E, 2008, 77: 036113.

[16] Wang, L., and Dai, G., Global stability of virus spreading in complex heterogeneous networks. SIAM J. Appl. Math., 2008, 68: 1495-1502.

[17] Zhang, J., and Jin, Z., The analysis of an epidemic model on networks. Appl. Math. Comput., 2011, 217: 7053-7064.

[18] Hoppensteadt, F., An age-dependent epidemic model. J. Franklin Inst., 1974, 297: 325-338.

[19] Hoppensteadt, F., Mathematical Theories of Populations: Demographics, Genetics and Epiemics, SIAM Publications, Philadelphia, 1975.

[20] Magal, P., McCluskey, C.C., Webb, G.F., Lyapunov functional and global asymptotic stability for an infection-age model. Appl. Anal. 2010, 89: 1109-1140.

[21] Huang, G., Liu, X., Takeuchi, Y., Lyapunov functions and global stability for age-structured HIV infection model. SIAM J. Appl. Math., 2012, 72: 25-38.

[22] Tarkhanov, N., Lyapunov stability for an age-structured population model. Ecol. Model., 2008, 216: 232-239.

[23] Liu, L.L., Wang, J.L., Liu, X.N., Global stability of an SEIR epidemic model with age-dependent latency and relapse. Nonl. Anal. RWA, 2015, 24: 18-35.

[24] Barabási, A.L., Albert, R., Emergence of scaling in random networks. Science, 1999, 286: 509-512.

[25] Liu, J., Tang, Y., and Yang, Z., The spread of disease with birth and death on networks. J. Stat. Mech., 2004, 2004: P08008.

[26] Zhu, G.H., Chen, G.R., Xu, X.J., Fu, X.C., Epidemic spreading on contact networks with adaptive weights. J. Theor. Bio., 2013, 317: 133-139.

[27] Hale, J.K. , Functional Differential Equations, Springer, Berlin, 1971.

[28] Browne, C.J., Plyugin, S.S., Global analysis of age-structured within-host virus model. Discret. Cont. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, 2013, 18: 1999-2017.

[29] Webb, G.F., Theory of Nonlinear Age-Dependent Population Dynamics, Marcel Dekker, New York, Basel, 1985.

[30] Hale, J.K., Asymptotic Behavior of Dissipative Systems, in: Math. Surv. Monogr., vol. 25, Am. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1988.

[31] Adams, R.A., Fournier, J.J.F., Sobolev Spaces, (2nd ed.), Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, New York, 2003.

[32] Thieme, H.R., Uniform persistence and permanence for non-autonomous semiflows in population biology. Math. Biosci., 2000, 166: 173-201.

[33] Hirsch, W.M., Hanisch, H., Gabriel, J.P., Differential equation models of some parasitic infections: methods for the study of asymptotic behavior. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 1985, 38: 733-753.

[34] Li, M.Y., Shuai, Z.S., Global-stability problem for coupled systems of differential equations on networks. J. Diff. Eqs., 2010, 248: 1-20.

[35] Hale, J.K., Verduyn, L.S.M., Introduction to Functional Differential Equations, New York: Appl. Math. Sci., Springer, 1993.

[36] Zhou, T., Liu, J., Bai, W., Chen, G.R., and Wang, B., Behaviors of susceptible-infectedepidemics on scale-free networks with identical infectivity. Phys. Rev. E, 2006, 74: 056109.

[37] Zhang, H.F., and Fu, X.C., Spreading of epidemics on scale-free networks with nonlinearinfectivity. Nonl. Anal. TMA, 2009, 70: 3273-3278.

[38] Zhu, G.H., Fu, X.C., Chen, G.R., Global attractivity of a network-based epidemic SIS model with nonlinear infectivity. Commun. Nonl. Sci. Numer. Simul. 2012, 17: 2588-2594.